

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 10, 13 and 17-18 are currently being amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-21 remain pending in this application.

Summary of Rejections:

Claims 1, 4-6, 9-14, 16 and 18-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,484,033 to Murray.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Murray in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,203,502 to Wilson et al. (hereinafter “Wilson”).

Claims 3, 15 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Murray in view U.S. Patent No. 6,169,899 to Havinis et al. (hereinafter “Havinis”).

Claims 7-8 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Murray in view U.S. Patent No. 7,024,195 to Miriyala et al. (hereinafter “Miriyaala”).

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Murray in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,621,414 to Nakagawa.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 4-6, 9-14, 16 and 18-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Murray. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s

interpretation of the disclosure of Murray as it relates to the pending claims and, therefore, traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. M.P.E.P. § 2131. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Id.*

Murray fails to teach or suggest all the features of the pending claims. Murray describes a location-based schedule management scheme for mobile users, which utilizes a user's distance and travel time to a particular point of interest. The particular point of interest corresponds to a time and location of an event, such as a meeting which has been scheduled for one of the mobile users. If it is determined that the mobile user is too far away, the system of Murray notifies another mobile users who is close enough to attend the event or meeting as a backup. In order to achieve this functionality, the system disclosed in Murray includes an application server which manages an event schedule and sends reminders to the mobile users at specified times in order to attend particular scheduled events. A notification is sent to another mobile user if the scheduled mobile user is unable to attend the scheduled event.

Murray fails to teach or suggest receiving “an area event notification request” that is recited in the pending claims. The sections of Murray relied upon by the Examiner as allegedly disclosing this feature (i.e., Murray, col. 10, lines 19-30) describe the various information within an event information, including the event time, location, criteria parameters and backup information, that are received from the wireless communication device or the schedule manager. Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, such information cannot be construed as an event notification “request.” Murray, in Figures 3 and 6, and in col. 6, lines 21-28, col. 7, lines 53-65 and col. 10, lines 5-47, specifically describes that a number of existing events (i.e., represented by reference numerals 128 in Figures 3 and 6) are stored in memory of the device or the server. The time and/or location of such pre-scheduled events are continually compared to the current time/location (i.e., represented by reference

numerals 111 in Figures 3 and 6). According to Murray, when a match is found, a predetermined action for that event is performed.

As such, Murray describes an operation that continually compares the pre-scheduled event parameters with the current parameters. This operation does not involve a “request” as recited in the pending claims and described in the originally filed specification at, for example, page 14, lines 19-38, page 16, lines 12-15, and in Figures 3 and 4. Therefore, Murray fails to teach or suggest at least the above-noted feature of claims 1 and 18. Accordingly, claims 1 and 18 are patentable for at least that reason.

Further, in order to expedite the prosecution of the present application, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 18 to recite providing “information regarding services to the mobile station in response to a notification that the mobile station is present in the geographical area of interest.” Support for this feature of amended claims 1 and 18 may be found in the originally filed specification and drawings at, for example, page 4, line 28 to page 5, line 16. These sections of the specification describe providing services to a mobile station in response to an indication that the mobile station is located within a geographical area of interest. Murray fails to teach or suggest this additional feature of amended claims 1 and 18. Accordingly, claims 1 and 18 are patentable for this additional reason.

Applicant has made additional amendments to claims 1, 10, 13, 17 and 18 to correct minor errors and to further clarify the recited features. These amendment do not affect the scope of the pending claims and are not made for any reasons related to patentability.

As to claims 4-6, 9-14, 16 and 19, these claims each depend, either directly or indirectly, from one of allowable claims 1 or 18 and are, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for other patentable features when these claims are considered as a whole.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-3, 7-8, 15, 17, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Murray in view of Wilson, Havinis, Miriyala or Nakagawa. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Wilson, Havinis, Miriyala or Nakagawa fail to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Murray. Further, claims 2-3, 7-8, 15, 17, 20 and 21 depend, either directly or indirectly, from one of allowable claim 1 or 18 and are, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 28 August 2009

By /G. Peter Albert, Jr./

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 30542
Telephone: (858) 847-6735
Facsimile: (858) 792-6773

G. Peter Albert Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,268